

4.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section addresses the potential cultural resources setting and impacts that could result from the granting of a new lease for the Long Wharf operations, as well as for project alternatives.

4.10.1 Environmental Setting

Prehistoric, Ethnographic, and Historic Background

The San Francisco Bay area was occupied as early as 8000 B.C., as indicated by radiocarbon-dated components from a site near San Jose (Moratto 1984:277). The period from 5000 through 2000 B.C. is represented by radiocarbon dates from this period from several sites around San Francisco Bay. Cultural material recovered from these sites indicate that occupants of the region were foragers who likely moved in a seasonal round between bay or coast and hills. Population densities were low and people probably moved to where resources could be obtained. Shellfish were collected, but were not as important as in later times. Large projectile points and millingstones indicate hunting and vegetal food processing. During this period, the occupants of the area probably spoke a Hokan language (Moratto 1984:277).

After 2000 B.C., large shell middens indicate more intensive use of marine resources from the bay. Material from sites dating from 2000 B.C. through 500 A.D. has been assigned to the Berkeley Pattern, which may represent an in-migration of Utian speakers from the Central Valley (Moratto 1984:279). By 1 A.D., many Berkeley Pattern settlements can be characterized as villages. Increased sedentism was made possible by reliance on acorns, a storable carbohydrate source, and shellfish, a protein source available year-round. Burial data indicate that there was little status differentiation and ceremonialism was not well developed. Trade goods were few and consisted of finished specimens, rather than raw materials.

The late prehistoric Augustine Pattern (500 A.D. through Spanish contact) represents a continuation of the same Berkeley Pattern material culture with the addition of the bow and arrow, the harpoon, tubular tobacco pipe, and pre-interment grave burning (Moratto 1984:283). During this period, population increased, there was increased status differentiation, greater trade and exchange using shell bead "money," and the spread of secret societies, cults, and associated ceremonialism.

Richmond is in territory occupied by the Native American group known to the Spanish and twentieth century ethnographers as the Costanoan (Levy 1978). The contemporary descendants of this group are members of the Ohlone Indian Tribe. The Costanoan group occupied the coast of California from San Francisco to Monterey and inland including the coastal mountains from the southern side of the Carquinez Strait to the eastern side of the Salinas River south of Chalone Creek. Costanoan actually refers to a language family consisting of eight related languages. Each language was spoken by a different ethnic group within a recognized geographical area. The political units within

1 each ethnic group were tribelets. Tribelet population varied from 50 to 500, with the
2 average being about 200. Each tribelet had one or more permanent villages and
3 several temporary camps within its territory. Collecting and hunting parties lived in
4 temporary camps when obtaining resources within the tribelet territory away from the
5 village.

6
7 Richmond is in the area occupied by speakers of the Chochenyo language. It is
8 estimated there were about 2,000 speakers of this language in A.D. 1770 (Levy
9 1978:485). The Chochenyo speakers were divided into at least six tribelets.

10
11 Each tribelet had a chief and the office was inherited patrilineally. In particular, the chief
12 fed visitors; directed ceremonial activities; organized hunting, fishing, and gathering;
13 and directed warfare expeditions. However, except during times of war, the chief did
14 not have coercive powers. The chief and elders council advised the community and
15 attempted to achieve consensus. The most frequent cause of war was infringement of
16 territorial rights. The bow and arrow were used in war. Trade between the coastal
17 Costanoan and inland Yokuts groups involved the exchange of coastal products, such
18 as mussels, abalone shells, dried abalone meat, and salt for inland products, such as
19 piñon nuts.

20
21 Acorns from four species of oak were the most important plant food. Nuts, berries,
22 seeds, and roots were also important. Costanoan groups practiced managed burning of
23 chaparral to encourage sprouting of seed plants and improve browsing for deer and elk.

24
25 The most important animals consumed were deer and rabbit. Other animals eaten
26 included elk, antelope, bear, and mountain lion. Whales and sea lions were eaten when
27 found stranded on the beach. Dog, wildcat, skunk, raccoon, and squirrel were also
28 eaten. Waterfowl were captured in nets using decoys. Steelhead, salmon, sturgeon,
29 and lampreys were the most important fish, and mussels and abalone were the most
30 important shellfish.

31
32 People lived in thatched dome houses with rectangular doorways and a central hearth.
33 Other structures in a village included sweathouses, dance enclosures, and an assembly
34 house. Technology included tule balsa canoes, bows and arrows, and baskets.
35 Chipped stone tools were made from chert obtained locally and obsidian obtained in
36 trade with other groups.

37
38 Seven missions were established by the Spanish in Costanoan territory between 1770
39 through 1797. The Mexican government closed the missions in the early 1830s.
40 Former mission lands were granted to soldiers and other Mexican citizens for use as
41 cattle ranches. Ranching continued during the American period that began when the
42 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed between Mexico and the United States in
43 1848. The Gold Rush of 1849 brought large numbers of Anglo-Americans to the area,
44 resulting in the rapid growth of San Francisco, which became the commercial entry port
45 for the region. Other towns in the Bay Area, such as Oakland and San Jose, developed

1 rapidly after the arrival of the Southern Pacific transcontinental railroad in 1869 (Beck
2 and Haase 1974). The Bay Area towns provided commercial, warehousing, financial,
3 and manufacturing services for the agricultural and mining areas farther east.
4

5 Richmond was undeveloped and rural until the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe
6 (AT&SF) Railroad made Point Richmond its terminus in the Bay Area in 1899. The
7 AT&SF was a transcontinental competitor of the Southern Pacific that provided service
8 to southern California beginning in the 1880s. However, the Southern Pacific's
9 monopoly of the Bay Area was not broken until the AT&SF purchased the
10 San Francisco and San Joaquin Valley Railroad (Stockton to Bakersfield) in 1898 and
11 negotiated rights to use the Southern Pacific track over the Tehachapi Mountains from
12 Bakersfield to the AT&SF line at Mojave (Bryant 1974:178). To reach San Francisco,
13 the AT&SF laid track from Stockton to Point Richmond on San Francisco Bay. The
14 AT&SF built maintenance yards, warehouses, and Long Wharf facilities at Point
15 Richmond. From Point Richmond, freight and passengers were taken by boat or barge
16 across the Bay to San Francisco. The first transcontinental freight and passenger
17 service on the AT&SF from San Francisco to Chicago began in the summer of 1900
18 (Bryant 1974:180).
19

20 In 1902, the Pacific Coast Oil Company established their refinery at Richmond on the
21 Potrero San Pablo north of Point Richmond. This location provided access to both rail
22 and water transportation. The Long Wharf was also built in 1902 to serve as a marine
23 terminal for the Refinery. The Refinery and Long Wharf were purchased by Standard
24 Oil Company of California in 1905. The Refinery became the largest refinery in the
25 western United States (Benet 1963:345). Additional industrial facilities came to
26 Richmond in 1935 when Ford Motor Company established an assembly plant there.
27 Richmond was primarily an industrial, rather than residential, center, as indicated by low
28 population figures. In 1940 only 24,000 people lived in Richmond. During World War II
29 a vast shipyard was built and the Inner Harbor Basin was developed. Over 750 ships
30 were built over a 4-year period (Benet 1963:345). This activity contributed greatly to
31 population growth in the city of Richmond during and after the war.
32

33 **Cultural Resources in the Vicinity of the Long Wharf**

34

35 A records search was obtained from the Northwest Information Center of the California
36 Historical Resources Information System. The records search showed that four
37 terrestrial archaeological sites and eight underwater shipwrecks are recorded within
38 1 mile of the Long Wharf. Three of the sites are prehistoric and one is historic. The
39 three prehistoric sites (CA-CCO-244, CA-CCO-276, and CA-CCO-284) are shell
40 middens recorded in the early twentieth century by Nels Nelson, an archaeologist from
41 the University of California. Subsequent industrial and residential development has
42 affected these sites. The historic site, CA-CCO-506H, is north of Castro Point and is
43 the site of a Chinese settlement for shrimp fishing and processing that operated from
44 the late 1860s to about 1913. The settlement included 25 structures (sheds and
45 houses), 5 piers, and shrimp drying platforms. No structures remain at the site today.
46

The eight shipwrecks are listed in Table 4.10-1. The information about the shipwrecks is from the CSLC and is on file at the Northwest Information Center and available on the CSLC website. The locational information in latitude and longitude is imprecise: one minute of latitude or longitude is about 1 mile. The descriptions of the locations indicate that two of the shipwrecks are south of the Long Wharf near Point Richmond. Point Richmond is over 1 mile from the Long Wharf. The other six shipwrecks are near Red Rock and Point Castro, less than 1 mile north and northwest of the Long Wharf.

**Table 4.10-1
Shipwrecks in the Vicinity of the Long Wharf**

CSLC Shipwreck No.	Latitude	Longitude	Location	Ship & Description
68	37 Deg 54'	122 Deg 23'	Point Richmond	Adele Hobson – motor vessel built 1904, sunk 1934, burned
446	37 Deg 54'	122 Deg 23'	Point Richmond	Associated Oil No. 8 – barge built 1926, sunk 1952, foundered
438	37 Deg 55'	122 Deg 25'	Near Red Rock	Buenos Dias – lumber schooner, no build date, sunk 1867, capsized
454	37 Deg 55'	122 Deg 25'	Red Rock	Anna R. Forbes – schooner, no build date, sunk 1867, grounded
584	37 Deg 55'	122 Deg 25'	Red Rock	Alton – oil screw, no build date, sunk 1904, grounded
663	37 Deg 55'	122 Deg 25'	Red Rock	W. Whipple – sloop, no build date, sunk 1880, stranded
489	37 Deg 56'	122 Deg 24'	Point Castro	City of San Raphael – sidewheel steamboat, built 1924, sunk 1943, wrecked
1366	37 Deg 59'	123 Deg 25'	Between Red Rock and San Pablo Bay	Ocean Bird – sloop, no build date, sunk 1869, collision

Source: CSLC Reflex Database, updated 9 August 1991, amended 30 April 2002 via information from CSLC website.

There are hundreds of historic structures in Richmond that are part of the Richmond National District. Most of these are more than 1 mile from the Long Wharf. However, the original Richmond town center, dating to 1901, was near the AT&SF tracks around the intersection of Washington Avenue, Cottage Avenue, and Park Place. Several structures in this area are contributing features to the Point Richmond National Register Historic District and are listed in the Contra Costa County Historic Resources Inventory. Whaling stations were located at Point Richmond and other areas. One legacy is that the Castro Point Marina was made by dumping dirt on several old whaling ships abandoned in the mud. In addition, there was extensive ferry service where the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge is now. In addition, Red Rock Island is listed in the Contra Costa County Historic Resources Inventory. Red Rock Island is the point where three county boundaries (San Francisco, Marin, and Contra Costa) intersect. It was used as a quarry for rock for road building and for industrial uses. It is privately owned and is now used by fishermen.

The Long Wharf is more than 50 years old. It was built in 1902 by the Pacific Coast Oil Company as the marine terminal for its Refinery (CSLC 1996:9). The Long Wharf and Refinery were purchased by Standard Oil of California in 1905. Currently, the Long Wharf is a pier which consists of a 3,680-foot causeway that connects the shore to a Long Wharf, which is perpendicular to the causeway at the terminus of the causeway. Additional information is provided in Section 4.11.2, Regulatory Setting, Structural Conditions of the Wharf. The 1915 USGS San Francisco Quad shows that the perpendicular extension (wharf) of the pier to the northwest had not yet been built. The 1942 Corps San Francisco Quad shows that a portion of the Long Wharf extending to the northwest was in place, but it did not yet extend to its current length of 2,460 feet. In 1947, the original wooden causeway that was supported by wooden piles was replaced with a concrete causeway structure supported on concrete piles (CSLC 1996:9). Three buildings and a concrete repair wharf were also constructed near the intersection of the causeway and the wharf. The Long Wharf was also reconstructed with concrete at this time. In 1974, the Long Wharf was modified to accommodate large vessels. Existing berths were modified and new berths were constructed. There have been numerous other changes and additions since 1974 (CSLC 1996:9). A seismic strengthening program was recently completed on the causeway and wharf, consisting of replacement of the concrete piles with steel piles. Additional information on the upgrade program is provided in Section 4.11.1, Environmental Setting, Structural Conditions of the Wharf.

4.10.2 Regulatory Setting

Federal

A number of Federal statutes, regulations, and rules govern the protection of cultural resources in the project area, including:

- The Antiquities Act of 1906;
- The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966;
- Executive Order 11593;
- The Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1979;
- The American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978; and
- The Shipwreck Preservation Act of 1987.

State

The pertinent State legislation and local plans that govern the protection of cultural resources in the project area include:

- The CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines (Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 and Appendix K);

- The CCC Guidelines for Permitting Archaeological Investigations;
- CSLC policies and procedures;
- The Native American Heritage Commission Guidelines (1989); and
- The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)-published checklists that are broadly applicable: (1) adequacy of archaeological testing programs, (2) determinations of site significance and uniqueness, and (3) mitigation reports.

4.10.3 Significance Criteria

The State CEQA guidelines (Section 15064.5) state that a project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource is considered to have a significant adverse effect on the environment unless mitigated. Historical resources are buildings, structures, districts, sites, or objects that are eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.5) define historical resources as follows:

Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource has integrity and meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR as follows:

- (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

4.10.4 Impacts Analysis and Mitigation Measures

The only potential historical resource in the project area is the Long Wharf, originally a timber wharf built in 1902. However, the Long Wharf was rebuilt using concrete piles in 1947 and using steel piles in 1999. Although the Long Wharf has never been evaluated for the National Register of Historic Places nor the California Register of Historical Resources, it appears that the Long Wharf would not be determined eligible because it lacks integrity. The original timber Long Wharf probably had historical significance, but it no longer exists. Even the concrete Long Wharf built in 1947 lacks integrity because of recent modifications.

The proposed lease for operation of the Long Wharf would not affect historically significant resources eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources. The Long Wharf does not appear to be eligible and there are no other potential historical resources in the project area.

Because there are no shipwrecks in the immediate area of the Long Wharf, maintenance dredging and the potential modification of Berth No. 4 would also have no cultural resources impact.

4.10.5 Impacts of Alternatives

Impact CR-1: No Project Alternative

Decommissioning of the Long Wharf would have no impact on cultural resources since none exist beneath the wharf. The transferring of operations to other area marine terminals would have no significant impacts to cultural resources for wharves already in place, but could result in significant impacts (Class II or III) if new construction or modification of existing facilities may be required.

Under the No Project Alternative, Chevron's lease would not be renewed and the existing Long Wharf would be subsequently decommissioned with its components abandoned in place, removed, or a combination thereof. The decommissioning of the Long Wharf would follow an Abandonment and Restoration Plan as described in Section 3.3.1, No Project Alternative.

Under the No Project Alternative, alternative means of crude oil / product transportation would need to be in place prior to decommissioning of the Long Wharf, or the operation of the Chevron Refinery would cease production, at least temporarily. It is more likely, however, that under the No Project Alternative, Chevron would pursue alternative means of traditional crude oil transportation, such as a pipeline transportation, or use of a different marine terminal. Accordingly, this EIR describes and analyzes the potential environmental impacts of these alternatives. For the purposes of this EIR, it has been assumed that the No Project Alternative would result in a decommissioning schedule that would consider implementation of one of the described transportation alternatives.

Any future crude oil or product transportation alternative would be the subject of a subsequent application to the CSLC and other agencies having jurisdiction, depending on the proposed alternative.

As with the proposed Project, there is no potential to impact historical resources, since the Long Wharf is not considered eligible, because it lacks integrity and there are no other potential resources in the area, nor are there any shipwrecks in the immediate project area. Impacts associated with deconstruction would be less than significant (Class III). Long Wharf operations would be transferred to other Bay area terminals. For those terminals already operational, no impacts to cultural resources would occur. For a new terminal, there may be a potential for impacts to occur. Impacts would be assessed for citing of the facility under the CEQA process.

CR-1: No mitigation is required.

Impact CR-2: Full Throughput via Pipeline Alternative

The transferring of operations to other area marine terminals would have no impacts to cultural resources since those wharves are already in place. Construction of pipelines to transfer crude and product to the Refinery would have the potential to impact cultural resources along the alignment and result in significant (Class II) impacts.

With no Long Wharf, Chevron would be required to transport crude oil and product via one or more pipelines connected to other Bay Area terminals, and possibly the Central Valley. Construction of these pipelines may result in significant, adverse impacts (Class II) to cultural resources along the pipeline alignment. There is a high potential that prehistoric resources would be encountered, and less potential to affect historic resources. Each selected alignment would require investigation into the extent of resources, impacts, and design of mitigation.

Mitigation Measures for CR-2:

CR-2. The following mitigation measures would be required:

- Evaluate the potential for resources and perform records searches during route selection;
- For any identified resources, evaluate their significance and conduct data recovery, as necessary; and,
- During excavation, require an archaeological monitor be present if any new, unrecorded sites are discovered.

Rationale for Mitigation: These standard measures are designed to identify, properly record, and evaluate the significance of resources and to protect resources found during excavation from damage and destruction. The measures would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Impact CR-3: Conceptual Consolidation Terminal Alternative

Construction of new pipelines for connection to a consolidation terminal could affect cultural resources and result in a significant (Class II) impact.

As with the Full Throughput via Pipeline Alternative, a pipeline connection to a consolidation terminal could affect cultural resources along the alignment. Class II impacts would be expected. Site selection and construction of a consolidation terminal would be a separate CEQA action; however, potential impacts to cultural resources for the consolidation terminal could be expected to occur.

Mitigation Measures for CR-3:

CR-3. Implement MM CR-2.

Rationale for Mitigation: These standard measures are designed to identify, properly record, and evaluate the significance of resources and to protect resources found during excavation from damage and destruction. Measures would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

4.10.6 Cumulative Projects Impacts Analysis

Impact CUM-CR-1: Cumulative Projects Impacts Analysis

Sensitive resources exist in the Bay area and could be impacted by new construction or modification to existing facilities in areas that are previously undisturbed. The Long Wharf would not contribute adversely (Class III) to prehistoric or historic resources.

The cumulative projects identified within the area have the potential to result in significant, adverse impacts to cultural resources. Each project would require investigation into the extent of resources, impacts, and design of mitigation for that specific project. The Long Wharf would not contribute to any disturbances of prehistoric or historic resources within the cumulative environment.

CUM-CR-1: No mitigation is required.

Table 4.10-2 summarizes Cultural Resources impacts and mitigation measures.

Table 4.10-2
Summary of Cultural Resources Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Mitigation Measures
CR-1: No Project Alternative	CR-1: No mitigation required.
CR-2: Full Throughput via Pipeline Alternative	CR-2: Identify, record, evaluate and protect resources along pipeline alignments.
CR-3: Conceptual Consolidation Terminal Alternative	CR-3: Implement MM CR-2.
CUM-CR-1: Cumulative Projects Impacts Analysis	CUM-CR-1: No mitigation required.